

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIENE D. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-cv-01272-DAD-JDP (PS)

ORDER DISREGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
FILING

ECF Nos. 20 & 21

On September 13, 2021, the Clerk of Court closed this case pursuant to plaintiff's notice of voluntary dismissal. ECF No. 10. Several months later, plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. ECF No. 12. The court subsequently informed plaintiff that she was not permitted to file an amended complaint in a closed case and that if she wished to reopen the case, she must file a motion seeking relief from judgment. ECF No. 14. The court also notified her that it would neither reopen this case nor screen her amended complaint unless such a motion was filed and granted.


Plaintiff has since filed two motions requesting the Clerk of Court enter judgment in her favor. Neither of these filings constitute a proper request for relief from the voluntary dismissal of this action. *See Kalt v. Hunter*, 66 F.3d 1002, 1004 (9th Cir. 1995) (“[A] voluntary dismissal . . . is a judgment, order or proceeding from which Rule 60(b) relief can be granted.”). The filings will therefore be disregarded. Plaintiff is notified that the court will not respond to future filings

1 in this action that are not authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Federal Rules
2 of Appellate Procedure.

3 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's July 28, 2022 and August 26, 2022
4 filings, ECF Nos. 20 & 21, are disregarded.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: December 12, 2022


JEREMY D. PETERSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE